

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Claims 1-15 are pending and remain pending in this application.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that claims 8-10 and 13-15 are allowable. The Examiner has objected to claims 8-10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, namely claim 1. However, for reasons described below, it is believed that the rejection to claim 1 has been overcome, and so it is respectfully requested that the objection to dependent claims 8-10 be withdrawn.

In Section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable by Hermann et al. (U.S. Patent 4,885,803). Claim 1 calls for an information signal transmission system comprising a first device and a second device connected in a network, and recipient detecting means. A predetermined information signal is provided through the first and second devices. The recipient detecting means detects a recipient of the information signal. Based on the result detected by the recipient detecting means, the information signal supplied to the recipient through the first device is continuously supplied to the recipient through the second device. Accordingly, the recipient detecting means identifies the recipient and then the information signal that has been supplied to the first device is supplied to the second device based on the identity of the recipient. Therefore, the recipient can receive at the second device the information signal that had been received at the first device based on the

detected identity of the recipient. Furthermore, as called for in claim 1, the information signal transmission system detects the recipient and the recipient is distinct from the first and second devices.

The portions of Hermann et al. upon which the Examiner relies do not appear to disclose or suggest the system of claim 1. According to the portions of Hermann et al. referenced by the Examiner, Hermann et al. discloses a system for controlling a plurality of electronic devices from a remote location (Hermann et al., Fig. 1, col. 4 lines 31-33). A detector receives control signals from a remote control transmitter. The detector provides the control signals to a central host controller. The host controller receives control signals from one or more of multiple detectors and provides the control signals to appropriate centrally located electronic devices, such as a satellite receiver (Hermann et al., Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 3-7, and lines 34-65). The host controller provides entertainment signals from the electronic devices according to the received control signals back to devices at the locations of the detectors. Accordingly, the host controller detects for which electronic device a control signal has been received.

However, the portions of Hermann et al. relied upon by the Examiner do not appear to describe detecting a recipient and, based on that detection, providing an information signal to the recipient through a second device. Claim 1 of the present application differentiates between the recipient and the devices providing the information signal to the recipient. As discussed above, the recipient detecting means of claim 1 detects the recipient and the information signal that has been supplied to the recipient by the first device is supplied to the recipient by the second device

based on that detection. Hermann et al., as referenced by the Examiner, does not appear to address the recipient as distinct from the device. Therefore, the portions of Hermann et al. referenced by the Examiner do not appear to disclose or suggest detecting the recipient and supplying the information signal to the recipient by a second device based on that detection.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Hermann et al., as applied by the Examiner, does not anticipate or suggest claim 1, and so also does not anticipate or suggest claims 2-11 that depend therefrom.

The Examiner also contends in section 1 of the Office Action that portions of Hermann et al. disclose claim 12 of the present application. Claim 12 calls for a remote control device for an information signal transmission system. The information signal transmission system includes a plurality of devices connected in a network for providing a predetermined information signal through the devices. The remote control device transmits a remote control signal including an identification code identifying a recipient of the information signal. Accordingly, similar to claim 1, claim 12 differentiates between the devices for providing the information signal and the recipient of the information signal. The identification code in the remote control signal identifies the recipient. As described above, the portions of Hermann et al. reference by the Examiner do not appear to describe identifying the recipient as distinct from a device and so do not describe a remote control signal including an identification code identifying a recipient of the information signal.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Hermann et al., as applied by the Examiner, does not anticipate or suggest claim 12.

Based upon the foregoing, it is believed that claims 1-6 and 11-12 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Hermann et al., as referenced by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is believed that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-6 and 11-12 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hermann et al. (U.S. Patent 4,885,803) in view of Kimura (U.S. Patent 5,226,090). For the arguments described above, Hermann et al., as relied upon by the Examiner, does not anticipate or suggest claim 1, and so does not anticipate or suggest claim 7 that depends from claim 1. The Examiner does not rely upon Kimura to suggest claim 1, and so the combination of Hermann et al. and Kimura, as relied upon by the Examiner, does not anticipate or suggest claim 1 or its dependent claims, including claim 7.

Based upon the foregoing, it is believed that claim 7 is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Hermann et al., alone or in combination with Kimura. Accordingly, it is believed that the Examiner's rejection of claim 7 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the allowance of this application with Claims 1-15 is respectfully solicited.


In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:

  
William S. Frommer  
Reg. No. 25,506  
(212) 588-0800